9. Difficulties of the Jenmies arising under the Land Conservancy Regulation.

MR. NILAKANTAN NILAKANTAN NAMPUTIRI (*Member, Jenmi, Kottayam Division*) said that, owing to the inclusion of temples, temple premises and groves under *poramboke*, they were polluted by the entry of all classes of people under the impression that they were Sirkar lands, the trees in groves were cut and sold by the Government, and often it became necessary to remove the images elsewhere to prevent pollution.

Temple tanks were dug by the Hindus for the purposes of the Hindu devotees and *santikars*, and this had been recognised by the law courts. All classes of the people believed they had a right to use these tanks as they were recorded as *poramboke*.

Temple roads being treated as *porambokes*, *santikars* and other temple employés were inconvenienced. Though they were included within *sanketam* limits or formed part of *jenmom* holdings and were in the possession of *jenmies*, action was taken against them under the Land Conservancy Regulation. *Porambokes* adjoining temples situated on river banks were indiscriminately assigned away ; and bathing ghats used for ages by the *santikars* became unavailable for their use. While there had been erosion of the banks, the authorities recorded even portions of the registered holdings adjoining rivers and canals as *porambokes*. Similarly action under that Regulation was taken against owners of registered holdings adjoining roads. The Member prayed that the points urged by him should be considered and suitable redress granted wherever practicable.

DEWAN'S REPLY : Mr. Nilakantan Namputiri, your request will receive careful consideration at the hands of the Government.

10. Registry of Town Lands.

MR. N. KUNJURAMAN VAIDYAN (*Member, Nominated*) prayed for the reduction of the enhanced rates of assessment fixed for town lands under the *Revised Puduval Rules*. The definition of 'town' so as to include municipal towns, areas with a population of more than three thousand and those having a distinctly urban character was objectionable as that would cover the major part of the country. The townships under the *Revised Puduval Rules* were created without consulting the wishes of the local people affected. The adoption of population basis could not be regarded as satisfactory. People living in scattered houses in a tract interspersed with hills, valleys, canals and wet lands could hardly be regarded as living in towns. *Porambokes* adjacent to markets, public offices, and main thoroughfares and those situated in uninhabited areas should not be treated alike. Revenue officers were still doubtful as to the interpretation of Rules 33, 34 and 35 of the *Revised Puduval Rules* passed five years ago. There was conflict of views among Tahsildars and among Peishkars. As an illustration, he referred to the proceedings for the registry of one cent of *poramboke* land in Survey No. 248/5 B in the Kottarakara *pakuthi*. The owner of the adjacent land, Vakil Mr. N. Krishna Pillai, applied for its assignment on the 3rd Medam 1097, and the then Tahsildar found that there was no objection to its registry on a *taravila* of Rs. 10 and at the fourth *taram*. As the land was situated near the Railway station, the Tahsildar applied to the Peishkar and recommended its transfer from *poramboke* to *tarisu*. Before the sanction from the Peishkar's office was sent to the taluk office, that Tahsildar's successor, without inspecting the site, recommended the levy of a *taravila* of Rs. 40 and that was sanctioned. The party appealed to the Peishkar, and by that time a third Tahsildar was in charge of the taluk. He reported his agreement with his immediate predecessor's view, but on being specifically directed to inspect and report, he recommended the reduction of *taravila* to Rs. 20 ; and the Peishkar after local inspection accepted that view. On the appeal presented to the Land Revenue Commissioner, the *taravila* was reduced to Rs. 5.

The mode of assessment of tax was not correctly understood. The incidence of *taravila* on the annual assessment was not realised. In one instance in the Kottarakara taluk, owing to a mistake, a tax of 8 chs. alone was being realised against Re. 1–4 chs. due. The maximum assessment on one acre of town land under the rules was

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly